

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/049,690

Applicant(s)

TIEDEMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Charles G. Freay

Art Unit

3746

All Participants:

(1) Charles G. Freay.

(2) Gary A. Essmann.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 June 2005

Time: 2:00 pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

claim 1

Claims discussed:

1 and 4-8

Prior art documents discussed:

Roberts et al ('829), Alme et al, Loomis and Abendschein et al

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner noted that Roberts et al, Loomis and Roberts et al disclose axial piston machines with variable displacement having controllers actuated by separate hydraulic units (27 in Alme et al, 38 in Loomis, and 202 in Roberts et al). These references thus anticipate claim 1. The examiner also noted that Abendschein et al discloses a variable displacement axial piston pump with an oil separator in the outlet. The separator provides oil to the lubrication system. The oil separator of Abendschein et al does not provide compressed oil to a displacement control devise. The examiner suggested incorporating claim 4 into claim 1. Mr. Essmann agreed to this change and also to other changes, as set forth in the examiner's amendment, made for the purposes of clarity and to provide correct claim dependancy.